

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 712

CE 056 557

AUTHOR Edelson, Paul J.
TITLE Codification and Exclusion: An Analysis of the Early Years of the National University Extension Association, 1915-1923.
PUB DATE 22 Mar 90
NOTE 19p.; Partial support was provided by the Syracuse University Kellogg Project in Adult Education. A version of this paper was presented at the Visiting Scholar Conference on the History of Adult Education (Syracuse, NY, March 22, 1990).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Colleges; Consortia; *Continuing Education; *Educational History; *Extension Education; Group Membership; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; *National Organizations; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *National University Extension Association

ABSTRACT

The National University Extension Association (NUEA) was formed in 1915 by 21 colleges and universities--state, land grant, and independent. From its inception, the organization moved rapidly to codify academic formats, operational procedures, and administrative structures for extension education based upon prevailing models found within traditional academia. At the same time, NUEA espoused a view of the field of continuing higher education that was specialized, institutionally. Therefore, NUEA excluded from membership most university-level schools, even when the continuing education programs of these institutions were comparable and, in some cases, considered superior. During the period from 1915 to 1923, standardization of practice and universality in membership were viewed as incompatible goals for the NUEA. Impetus was thereby given to the formation of alternative organizations within continuing higher education representing other types of institutions, such as teachers' colleges. (Appendixes include nine references and a listing of the NUEA founding institutions.) (Author/YLB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED326712

CODIFICATION AND EXCLUSION:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE EARLY YEARS OF THE
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION, 1915-1923

Dr. Paul J. Edelson, Dean
School of Continuing Education
and
Director, Continuing Education Research Center
State University of New York
at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4310
(516) 632-7052

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Edelson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Partial support for this research was provided by the
Syracuse University Kellogg Project in Adult Education.
A version of this paper was presented at the Visiting
Scholar Conference on the History of Adult Education,
Syracuse University, March 22, 1990

CE 056557

CODIFICATION AND EXCLUSION:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE EARLY YEARS OF THE
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION (NUEA)
1915 - 1923

ABSTRACT

The National University Extension Association (NUEA) was formed in 1915 by twenty-one colleges and universities - state, land grant and independent. From its inception, the organization moved rapidly to codify academic formats, operational procedures, and administrative structures for Extension based upon prevailing models found within traditional academia. At the same time, the NUEA espoused a view of the field of continuing higher education that was specialized institutionally, for the most part excluding from membership non-university level schools although the continuing education programs of these institutions were comparable, and in some cases considered superior. In the period studied, standardization of practice and universality in membership were viewed as incompatible goals for the NUEA. Thus impetus was given to the formation of alternative organizations within continuing higher education representing other types of institutions.

INTRODUCTION

When university extension leaders from twenty-one colleges and universities met in Madison, Wisconsin from March 10-12, 1915 and formed the National University Extension Association they recognized the historic importance of that activity for the university extension movement. The founders were aware that this was only the second national conference exclusively dedicated in name to university continuing education in the United States. The first had occurred twenty-four years earlier in 1891 under the auspices of the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching (Stephan, 1948). This organization was originally named the Philadelphia Society for the Extension of University Teaching, when it was founded in 1890. The American Society had no formal connections with any higher education institutions although many of its leaders and lecturers were drawn from area universities. Its programs resembled the popular orientation of the Chautauqua in content and format. The Society's ten year report, published in 1901, indicated that of thirty-five courses sponsored in autumn 1900, none were scheduled to be held at a university. Libraries, YMCA's, public schools and private learning societies, such as the Brooklyn Institute, were among the course locations listed. (American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, 1901). The American Society was loosely organized and continued operations until about 1916 when it was

Codification and Exclusion

merged with other local groups into an association known as the Philadelphia Forum. The reincorporation of "Philadelphia" in the name strongly suggests that the goal of a truly national organization was never attained.

The NUEA founders were consciously operating against this backdrop of failure for a national continuing higher education organization in America. They also were part of a field noted for a heterogeneous mixture of programs, sponsors, and objectives. There was at that time in America a checkered melange of local extension courses under various sponsorships (Knowles, 1977). A great many of these, particularly at colleges and universities, drew inspiration from what was known as the "English pattern" since it emanated originally from English universities, Cambridge and later Oxford, in the second half of the 19th Century (Draper, 1923). This approach emphasized, in England, lectures with colloquiums and examinations and sought to partially address inequities inherent in the rigid, socially stratified system of formal higher education in Great Britain. The British strain, loosened and modified, characterized American continuing higher education in the period 1880-1906. Extension, the term used to describe adult education, existed within a larger milieu of higher education which excelled in creating numerous institutional options for true mass formal higher education provided at a growing number of state-supported institutions.

The period 1906-1913 witnessed a great revival of interest in University Extension programs and as many as twenty-eight were organized for the first time. Twenty-one colleges and universities reorganized their extension work under separate administrative units during this same period (Reber, 1914). The creation of separate college divisions of extension was a way of addressing what evidently came to be viewed as a legitimate area of collegiate activity. These divisions became widespread because of the need to coordinate a growing number of credit courses taught by a diverse university faculty in addition to an expansion of non-credit offerings.

Within the American Extension program the British lecture system of relatively informal short programs and lectures merged with both the Chautauqua approach and with the more structured forms of adult education at the university that were evident in regular credit coursework offered through correspondence, extramural (off-campus) teaching, or organized intramural (on-campus) for part-time adult populations who were not addressed by traditional credit programs, both undergraduate and graduate. As Extension came to be viewed as a recognized activity of institutions committed to the general welfare of the population, a rationale was also established for a more



Codification and Exclusion

professional, disciplined approach. This required a dedicated administrative and support staff and even in some institutions, a separate faculty.

The stage was thereby set for the emergence of a new national continuing education organization. Of the original twenty-one NUEA members, all were from public institutions with the exception of Columbia University, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Chicago (See Appendix A). Ten of the total administered their continuing education program through separate divisions (Reber, 1914). All of the founding NUEA institutions had "university" status except for Iowa State College, Kansas State Agricultural College, and Pennsylvania State College. This uniqueness shared by Iowa, Kansas and Penn State would later become an issue when other non-university grade institutions applied for admission.

A CONCEPT OF PROFESSIONALIZATION AND CRITICAL EARLY ISSUES

The "Proceedings" of the First National University Extension Conference is impressive in the level of its detail and comprehensiveness. Although only forty-five people attended the conference as either delegates or visitors, they met for three days and participated in thirty-five sessions and discussion groups. This scale and appetite for sharing information set the pattern for subsequent years. The conference opened with a keynote address by Charles Van Hise, President of the University of Wisconsin, who has come to be known for his articulation of what is called "The Wisconsin Idea," identifying the scope of the university's activities with the borders of the state. Van Hise's presentation was detailed, describing the current status of university extension activity in the United States. Other sessions of the conference explored the administration and organization of university extension, extension activities in engineering, agriculture, commercial and industrial education, correspondence teaching, lecture and entertainment programs, health instruction, the humanities, extension lecturing, cooperation with state medical societies, and training courses for teachers. In short, an encyclopedic review of Extension was given setting a tone of scientific scrutiny and self-examination for the field.

Louis E. Reber, Dean of the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin, who later in the Conference would be elected the first President of the NUEA, spoke following President Van Hise whose speech he undoubtedly shaped. He described the halting steps that were taken leading up to the Madison meeting and conceded the uncertain status of University Extension in the country, "...its methods, even where most

Codification and Exclusion

highly developed, are to a degree experimental" (NUEA Proceedings, 1915, p. 26). He went on to propose an initial scheme of administrative classification to be adopted by other institutions. This organization plan, in place at Wisconsin, had three main divisions: extramural instruction; direct public service through university departments with an applied research dimension, eg. forestry, public health; and intramural instruction.

In the question and answer period which followed his talk, detailed exchanges on Wisconsin's extension program took place. Towards a concluding part of the Conference Ira W. Howerton, Director of University Extension Service at the University of California, echoed Reber's quest for a more scientific approach and challenged the group to enunciate some general principles of Extension "that might be applied everywhere in the light of different opinions and ideas that currently existed" (NUEA Proceedings, 1915, p. 151). That need, shared by others, became the leitmotif of subsequent NUEA meetings wherein the drive to clearly articulate the basic dimensions of the field found expression. Subjects fundamental to the emergence of Extension as a legitimate, structured field such as appropriate nomenclature for continuing education, standardization of courses for transfer credit, administration and organization, professional development for extension personnel, and the correct place of Extension within the university were to be refined and canonized within a relatively brief period of time.

At that first meeting in 1915, a motion to form a permanent organization called the National University Extension Association was passed. It was to have an institutionally based membership limited to colleges of university grade. Director Mallory of the University of Chicago stated, "I simply want to exclude those which are not of recognized standard" (NUEA Proceedings, 1915, p.218). He was including in that category normal schools, teachers colleges and other colleges that did not come up to the Carnegie "fifteen unit" criterion (Rudolf, F., 1962). Schools in this group did not uniformly require students to complete all their high school work beforehand and thus had to schedule it alongside of regular college courses. Normal schools, in addition, had a two year course of study. Colleges stood between normal schools and the University. (NUEA Proceedings, 1920). The NUEA founders did not want to admit to membership institutions of this lower academic caliber who offered non-collegiate and less than full university curricula. In this first of many future discussions of NUEA admissions criteria, Dean Miller of the Kansas State Agricultural College stated, perhaps self-consciously since he was not from a "university grade" institution, "It is possible

Codification and Exclusion

that some of these colleges may do just as good extension work as some of the higher universities of higher standards" (NUEA Proceedings, 1915, p.219). But the feeling remained that, as expressed by Professor Lighty of the University of Wisconsin, "If we did not follow some method of exclusion, every institution that wanted to could come in" (NUEA Proceedings, 1915, p.220). In order to move on to other business at the meeting it was decided to carry the discussion of the membership issue over to the next Annual Conference where, presumably, it would be resolved.

This evidence suggests that NUEA founders viewed their occupational status as primarily identified with their institutions, and only secondarily with the continuing education field at large as it then existed. They acted to differentiate the practice of Extension at the university from what others did elsewhere in higher education even though admittedly, there might not be any substantial difference. They also focused on factors common to the emerging mission of continuing education in NUEA institutions which would subsequently enhance and promote greater credibility among their academic colleagues within their own universities. Thus, one observes simultaneously a turning-in of the NUEA away from a broader membership base accompanied by a simultaneous drive to exquisite refinement on certain issues. Two of these preoccupations concerned standardization in nomenclature and in credit course structure.

Standardization in Nomenclature and Credit Course Structure.

At the Second Annual NUEA Conference, held in Chicago, April 12-14, 1916, Richard R. Price, Director of the General Extension Division of the University of Minnesota, presented a paper entitled "Nomenclature for University Extension." In it he reasoned that "Since we now have a national organization of Extension workers, the matter of uniformity of nomenclature begins to be of importance" (NUEA Proceedings, 1916, p. 30). Price was wrestling with how the extension units should refer to themselves within the context of the university.

He proposed that the overall Extension unit of the university be called the "Extension Division." The word "department," Price suggested, should apply to large functional units within the Extension Division. Further sub-divisions within departments would be called "bureaus." By proposing the creation of departments within Extension Divisions Price was drawing a parallel between the position of head extension administrator and that of academic divisional director or dean to whom reported individual department chairs. He was thus imposing on

Codification and Exclusion

Extension the distinctive, familiar pattern of academic hierarchy, which would also convey enhanced prestige to continuing education leaders, by borrowing terminology from the highest status component of the university - the academic sector. Price also urged his colleagues to use the term "course" in a more limited, academically accepted manner so that it referred specifically to a subdivision of a subject, eg. "Course 1 in English" giving it a typical academic meaning rather than the more general phrase "course of study" which had a vaguer connotation (NUEA Proceedings, 1916, p. 32). He ended his remarks by stating that:

This discussion of nomenclature would be vain if it did not lead to action. It is not implied, of course, that this association can take any action which, will be binding on the membership institutions. Yet if an agreement can be reached here as to the use of a uniform and standardized nomenclature, some confusion and misunderstanding between one institution and another may thereby be eliminated (NUEA Proceedings, 1916, p. 33).

At the same conference Mr. Wayland J. Chase, Associate Professor of History at University of Wisconsin, pointed out that "there are still those in high places and in low who remained unconvinced" of the value of teaching by mail "whom we must convert" (NUEA Proceedings, 1916, p.33). This feeling was shared by the association membership who saw a "great outstanding need" for the standardization of Extension courses, particularly credit courses, which formed the bulk of correspondence teaching (NUEA Proceedings, 1916, p. 33).

As an outgrowth of the 1916 conference two important Standing Committees were formed - one on Nomenclature chaired by Richard Price and the other on the Standardization of Credit Courses led by W. D. Henderson. Both groups moved quickly to delineate the organizational framework for Extension.

At the Third Annual Conference held in Pittsburgh, April 11-13, 1917 a progress report from the Committee on Standardization of Credit Courses was given by W.D. Henderson, Chairman and also Director of University Extension at the University of Michigan. Henderson outlined the large enrollment in these credit courses

Codification and Exclusion

which he estimated at more than 50,000 students and the rapid rate of increase which he projected at 100%, presumably annually. He foresaw this large and growing number of students presenting their credits for inclusion into university degree programs: "That is going to raise in the minds of administration officers the question of the validity of this type of work" (NUEA Proceedings, 1917, p.51). Howerton, from the University of California, later amplified this concern:

We have to deal with the problem of maintaining the standard of the University with respect to amount and quality of work, in the first place, and in the second place, of developing on the part of the faculties of the University a recognition that we are maintaining that standard; meaning that in no wise does University Extension offer easy access to credit for a degree (NUEA Proceedings, 1917, p.54). (emphasis added)

Howerton had identified what he perceived as the basic assumption of faculty - that all extramural work was inferior to residence work. Once again the strategy to be followed by the Association in uplifting the image of Extension would be identical as that followed in the administrative/organization nomenclature issue - to adapt prevailing structural definitions that were already in place. This would make Extension credit courses appear as much like regular credit courses as possible even though in content, level of instruction, qualifications of students, and monitoring of quality there might still be deficiencies at this early stage of their evolution.

At this 1917 meeting a report on nomenclature was given by the Committee on Nomenclature. The recommendations made by Richard R. Price in 1916 were officially accepted, to be circulated among the membership for consideration, with one significant modification. The division-department-bureau arrangement was endorsed with the caveat that "the establishment of departments [within Extension Divisions] does not necessarily call for the appointment of department heads" (NUEA Proceedings, 1917, p. 89). So, although extension heads might be called deans or directors, the academic analogy would not be carried further down into the ranks of Extension personnel.

Codification and Exclusion

It was also proposed and accepted that the unit of credit for correspondence work be the semester hour, bringing this activity squarely into the conventional instructional format for credit.

A main theme of the Fourth Annual Conference held in Chicago in January 1919 was once again the stabilization of university Extension credit work. W.D. Henderson, Extension Director of the University of Michigan, Chaired the Conference and would be elected NUEA President for the following year. In his capacity as Chair of the Standardization Committee Henderson pointed out that some universities accepted credit work from Extension while others did not. A related issue was the transfer of Extension credit work from one institution to another. He proposed in his Committee report that the NUEA establish standards, policies, and precedents for University Extension in the United States that would address both problems. The Association voted to continue the work of the Standardization Committee over into the following year.

The Fifth Annual Conference held in Ann Arbor in April 1920 is a watershed in the history of the NUEA. The two major reports standardizing nomenclature and credit courses were officially approved and made NUEA policy bringing to a close the work of the two committees and fulfilling a need expressed by Ira Howerton in 1915 for general principles of Extension that might be applied everywhere. Richard Price presenting the Nomenclature Report stated:

We want common standards of credit and common estimates of scholarship so that our marks may become current and inter-changeable currency among all the membership institutions. It is necessary to the continuity and the permanency of our work that our marks be accepted at their face value anywhere. This can be accomplished only through exact definition of terms and rigid adherence to standards and agreements respecting scholarship (NUEA Proceedings, 1920, p. 10). (emphasis added)

The Nomenclature Committee recommended for adoption the administrative scheme of division - department - bureau. Although they toyed with using the term "college" or "school" for the extramural unit they recognized that doing so at this stage would be giving it a "rank" in the university system which few universities are as yet ready to recognize (NUEA

Codification and Exclusion

Proceedings, 1920, p.10). Similarly, "director" was chosen as the preferred title for the head administrator of Extension. The use of the term "dean" was deemed inappropriate at this time and was to be held in abeyance until the arrival of "school" or "college" status for Extension. The definition for "course" would be that adopted by the Association of American Universities, whether extramural, correspondence, or intramural. The term "short course" first appeared in the NUEA records at this time. Borrowed from Agricultural Extension, it referred to a brief, non-credit experience. This term was recommended to be used with qualifications, always showing the exact scope and duration.

A critical issue in the report had to do with an agreement among NUEA institutions as to what constituted a standard unit of credit. "The aim must be an equivalence of quality and of ground covered and an equivalence of standards of scholarship" (NUEA Proceedings, 1920, p.13). The Committee emphasized that eight correspondence assignments should equal one semester hour of university credit. Extramural Extension classes meeting one night a week for two hours for a sixteen week semester would carry two semester hours of credit. The report stated emphatically, "It is of great importance that an agreement be arrived at on this point if in no other point in this report" (NUEA Proceedings, 1920, p.13). The report was accepted and made Association policy.

In a similar vein, W.D. Henderson presented the "Report of the Committee on Standardization of Extension Credit Courses." This sixteen page opus was printed fully in the Proceedings indicating the intended impact the organization leaders felt it should have on the developing adult education field. In fact, later NUEA statements of Principles borrowed extensively from the Report's conclusion (National University Extension Association, C. 1954). The subheadings of the report were "Classification of Extension Courses", "Method of Instruction", "Types of Educational Institutions giving Extension Credit Courses", "Importance of Standardization", "Character and Context of Extension Credit Courses", "Conditions of Admission to Extension Credit Courses", "Time allotted to Extension Class Work", "Instructors", "Examinations", "Credits", "Records", "Transfer of Credits", and "Conclusion." It is, in fact, a detailed treatise on the subject of Extension credit.

The report concluded with seven critical recommendations for the administration of University Extension courses, whether taught by direct class instruction or through correspondence. With minor modifications these would become the operating principles of the NUEA for at least the next thirty-five years.

Codification and Exclusion

They prescribed standards and procedures for the content of Extension credit courses, admissions of students, hours of instructors, evaluation of student work, appointment of faculty, awarding of credit, and the recording of grades.

The report was formally discussed and then unanimously approved and adopted. It, along with the report on Nomenclature, represented the culmination of the drive towards the codification of Extension practice, the primary driving force in the founding of the NUEA. Within five years of the creation of the organization the infra-structure of university Extension was firmly established. It would take only three years longer to reach de facto closure on the membership issue. By 1923 the pattern of largely turning away non-university grade institutions had become firmly entrenched in the NUEA.

MEMBERSHIP: INCLUSION VS. EXCLUSION

The NUEA membership policy of admitting university grade institutions initially expressed in 1915 was more fully stated in the first official constitution and Bylaws included in the 1916 proceedings. Membership would be limited to "colleges and universities of known and recognized standing whose sole aim is educational service (NUEA Proceedings, 1916, p. 194). All applications for membership would require a unanimous vote of the Association's Executive Committee before being submitted to the Association membership for a vote. Harvard University was added under this policy

Codification and Exclusion

in 1916, followed in 1917 by the Universities of Oregon, Utah, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Texas. The total membership now stood at twenty seven and the state university coloration was becoming more pronounced as the following breakdown makes clear:

	1915	1916	1917
State Universities	14 (67%)	14 (64%)	19 (70%)
Private Universities	4 (19%)	5 (23%)	5 (19%)
State Colleges:	<u>3</u> (14%)	<u>3</u> (14%)	<u>3</u> (11%)
	21	22	27

The Association membership was more homogeneous in 1917 with 89% of the members drawn from full universities. In 1918 the Association did not meet. At the 1919 Conference the report on membership indicated that no new institutions had been added. This was not the case in 1920 when the NUEA accepted the Universities of Nebraska, Arizona, Kentucky, Alabama, Arkansas, Washington University (St. Louis), the State College of

Codification and Exclusion

Washington at Pullman, and the Massachusetts Department of Education.

No explicit discussion of NUEA membership appears again until the last page of the Proceedings for the Sixth Annual Conference held in Iowa City in 1921 when it was reported by the Association's Secretary/Treasurer, A.J. Klein, that he received weekly from fifteen to twenty letters concerning extension and adult education from institutions and individuals not members. Klein observed:

The nature of these inquiries and the character of the institutions concerned indicated that unless this Association opens its membership to a wider circle, new adult education associations will be formed and the leadership of the National University Extension Association in this field seriously threatened (NUEA Proceedings, 1921, p.107).

This declaration by Klein dramatically revealed to the entire Association the choices it now faced - either to broaden its base and incorporate a flood of newcomers, or to move slowly and add several new compatible institutions each year. Klein prophesized that by adhering to the status quo other adult education organizations would be formed.

At the Seventh Annual Conference held the following year in 1922 in Lexington, Kentucky the issue of accepting normal schools and teacher colleges into the Association was brought up by Mr. Ingham from the University of Kansas. He reasoned that representatives of these two types of institutions had attended the Association's meeting at the Fifth National Conference in Michigan and it was found that "we had much in common and that they had the same problems we had" (NUEA Proceedings, 1922, p.136). He felt that a common sense approach should bring together organizations doing similar work in the Extension field. He even suggested, in anticipation of objection, that a new category of affiliation, short of full membership, be established.

Henderson from Michigan, former NUEA President and former Chair of the Committee on Standardization, led the counterattack arguing the contrary position that organizational membership be limited rather than expanded. J.W. Scroggs, Director of the Extension Division at the University of Oklahoma, supporting Henderson, offered the argument that admitting these new

Codification and Exclusion

colleges would complicate standardization, the most critical issue dealt with by the Association. Others arguing for inclusion stressed that in-residence credit work offered in the normal schools and colleges was already presented by students for credit when they transferred to a university. As these institutions commenced extramural Extension work for credit, this too in all likelihood would be accepted as transfer credit. It made sense, therefore, to bring everyone together.

Mr. Patrick, from the University of Kentucky, stated prophetically, "If we do not affiliate [with them] we shall grow further apart" (NUEA Proceedings, 1922, p.137). Henderson, (NUEA Proceedings, 1922, p.137). Henderson, arguing again in favor of the status quo brought up that in admitting newcomers the coziness of the organization was threatened:

This meeting has not been so successful as the last because the last was a smaller meeting. We sat around a table and got together. I believe that in so far as you enlarge your meeting the initial aim of the organization is defeated (NUEA Proceedings, 1922, p.137). (emphasis added)

The discussion was continued when the Committee on Membership and Affiliation presented its report later in the Conference just prior to adjournment. Mr. Ingham, giving the Committee's report, stated that his committee unanimously proposed the University of the State of New York and Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College for admission. Both were accepted although there was some discussion concerning Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical and its relationship to the University of Mississippi. A question was asked if there were other institutions that had applied for membership. Ingham responded that normal schools and teachers colleges had. The same heated discussion which had occurred earlier in the meeting erupted again. Since the conference was about to conclude, it was suggested that the Membership and Affiliation Committee present a report to be given at the next Annual Conference on the subject including normal schools and teachers colleges.

This took place in St. Louis, MO. from April 19-21, 1923 and was the Eighth Annual Conference of the NUEA. As promised, H.G. Ingham, Director of University Extension at the University of Kansas presented the Report on Membership. The first paragraph must have stunned the audience:

Codification and Exclusion

There is one thing that was up for consideration last year, that has been settled in another way so that the problem of applications from teachers colleges is, I think, no longer one that needs to receive any serious consideration on the part of the membership committee of this Association, for the reason that the teachers colleges have perfected the organization which they had under way last year and now have their National Extension Association of Teachers Colleges, with a present membership of twenty-six institutions and many applications (NUEA Proceedings, 1923, p.109).

Ingham went on to observe that applications from those schools "need not be given consideration" since they would in all likelihood go to the new association. With that problem neatly disposed of, the NUEA should amend its present constitution concerning membership "looking to a more liberal policy in the admission of additional institutions to the Association, or the establishment of an associate membership" (NUEA Proceedings, 1923, p.109).

This amounted to locking the barn door after the horses had already gone; it was an empty gesture. In addition, the Committee recommended that in evaluating prospective institutions two new principles be applied: their educational standing and the extent to which their Extension work met NUEA standards referring to the policies adapted in 1920. The Membership Committee also pointed out that although the Henderson Committee Report on Standardization had been accepted two years ago, no mechanisms were yet in place to ensure or evaluate how fully they were being implemented by existing NUEA institutions.

Although in later years a Visitation Committee to evaluate the quality of prospective member institutions was developed the organization never applied the same scrutiny to institutions already members even though surveys were conducted to determine the extent of compliance on various aspects of NUEA policy. Walton S. Bittner, Secretary/ Treasurer of the NUEA in 1955 was able to write, with a tone of resignation, on the subject of non-conforming Association members:

Codification and Exclusion

After all from the beginning we have had "weak sisters" in our Association, far weaker than many colleges that have sought in vain for admission. Yet there has been no policy to eliminate our weaker members and their presence is no real detriment to improvement [of the Association] by conference and other communications. (Bittner, 1955).

CONCLUSION

When the NUEA was formed in 1915 the founders were trying to consolidate their organizational positions as Extension leaders within their own institutions. As part of this strategy they were structuring a developing field of university activity which was also simultaneously receiving attention in non-university grade institutions. The early activities of the NUEA articulated, modified, and standardized the practice and format of Extension based upon existing academic modes. The Association also erected a barrier separating those in higher status university grade institutions from those in lesser grade colleges and normal schools by refusing to act positively on membership applications from those institutions. As a consequence, impetus was given to the formation of another continuing higher education organization representing, in the case cited, teachers colleges.

The differences of opinion within the Association on the membership issue revealed divergent viewpoints on the evolving purpose of the NUEA. Those who favored the status quo advanced the claim that the work of creating standards and standardization was not yet complete and by admitting those from "lower quality" institutions at this stage, initial accomplishments would be placed at risk. Those with the broader, yet minority, viewpoint argued more idealistically for membership standards that would incorporate Extension professionals throughout higher education. They saw the Association in the vanguard of a national adult education movement. The less inclusive viewpoint prevailed at this stage of the NUEA's history. Clearly the majority of the members were satisfied with the Association's impressive accomplishments in the first years of its existence and were optimistic about the NUEA's future, albeit within an exclusive niche of large state institutions. Although involved with the Progressive ideology of making higher education more widely available, they saw themselves as part of a university elite and perhaps more importantly as integral components of their institutions. They were determined not to jeopardize this new status that had been

Codification and Exclusion

earned for Extension by the NUEA which had succeeded in bringing greater prestige and recognition to this field through focused collective action in a selected number of critical areas.

REFERENCES

American Society for the Extension of University Teaching (1901). "Insert" in Ten year report of the American society for the extension of university teaching, 1890-1900. Philadelphia: The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching.

Bittner, W. S. (1955). Carbon copy of letter to Roy R. Tomkins, November 11, 1955. Syracuse University, Arents Research Library, NUEA Document Collection Box 1.

Draper, W. H. (1923). University extension: a survey of fifty years, 1873 - 1923. Cambridge, England: University Press.

Knowles, M. (1977). The adult education movement in the United States. New York: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.

National University Extension Association (c. 1954). Principles for credit instruction. Syracuse University, Arents Research Library, NUEA Document Collection, Box 1.

National University Extension Association Proceedings, 1915 - 1923.

Reber, L. E. (1914). University extension in the United States. Bulletin, U.S. Bureau of Education, No. 19.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university: a history. New York: Vintage Books.

Stephan, A. S. (1948). Backgrounds and beginnings of university extension in the United States. Harvard Educational Review, 18 (2), 99-108.

Appendix A

NEUA Founding Institutions, 1915

Columbia University
Indiana University
Iowa State College
Kansas State Agricultural College
Pennsylvania State College
State University of Iowa
University of California
University of Chicago
University of Colorado
University of Idaho
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of North Carolina
University of Oklahoma
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of South Carolina
University of South Dakota
University of Virginia
University of Wisconsin

